

Remarks

Claims 1 – 50 are pending. Claims 1 – 50 presently stand rejected. By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended; claims 4, and 16 – 50 have been cancelled; and claims 51 – 64 have been added. Examination and reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Drawing Objections

The drawings are presently objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Particularly, the Examiner indicated that “the claimed methods steps including, inter alia, ‘generating a partial outcome for a first sub-game,’ ‘determining an expected value of an outcome of the first sub-game arising from said partial outcome,” and ‘determining partial outcomes for remaining sub-game’ must be depicted or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).”

Claims 16 – 50 have been cancelled.

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added claims do not include such language, and are supported by the present Specification as discussed below.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claim 50 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, “as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.” See Page 3, Action.

Claim 50 has been cancelled. The rejection is therefore deemed moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 10, 36 – 41, and 43 – 45 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No 6,132,311 (“Williams”).

Claims 36 – 41 and 43 – 35 have been cancelled.

Claim 1 has been amended to include, among others, “wherein the expected value of a first sub-game as derived from the displayed partial outcome of the first sub-game is used to select the displayed fewer than full set of images of the remaining sub-games in the initial display.”

Support for amended claim 1 can be found in the Specification.

For example, paragraph [0008] provides an exemplary definition of an “expected value.”

For example, paragraphs [0078] to [0082] provide an exemplary explanation of how an expected value of one of the sub-games is used to determine images of the rest of the sub-games to be displayed.

Williams does not anticipate amended claim 1.

Rather, Williams merely describes the fact that cards are dealt as normal from a single deck or a sixty-five card deck. For example, Williams discloses that “the cards are dealt from a single standard deck of fifty-two playing cards. Alternatively, in another preferred embodiment of the present invention, a sixty-five card deck of playing cards may be used in which an additional thirteen card suit is added to the standard thirteen card suits of Spades, Hearts, Diamonds and Clubs.” See col. 6, lines 6 – 13.

Williams then discloses that a player is dealt two community cards face up from the shuffled deck of cards, and that five partial hands are also dealt face down also from the same shuffled deck of cards. Subsequently, the partial hands or the face down cards are turned face up. See col. 7, lines 1 – 3. That is, Williams does not describe using the community cards 32 or 36 to determine the five partial hands of three cards, 40, 50, 60, 70 and 80. Neither does

Williams describe using any of the partial hands 40, 50, 60, 70 and 80 to determine the cards dealt in any other the other partial hands 40, 50, 60, 70 and 80.

Therefore, Williams does not describe “the expected value of a first sub-game as derived from the displayed partial outcome of the first sub-game is used to select the displayed fewer than full set of images of the remaining sub-games in the initial display,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Williams.

Claim 2, 3, and 5 – 15 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 2, 3, and 5 – 15 are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 16 – 29 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams.

Claims 16 – 29 and 42 have been cancelled.

The rejections are thus deemed moot.

Claims 11 – 14, 30 – 34, and 46 – 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of U.S. Pub. No 2002/0183105 (“Cannon”).

Claims 30 – 34, and 46 – 49 have been cancelled.

The rejections of claims 30 – 34, and 46 – 49 are thus deemed moot.

Claims 11 – 14 depend from amended claim 1, and are therefore allowable in view of Williams.

Cannon fails to cure the deficiencies of Williams.

Rather, Cannon discloses a gaming machine that allows mutually concurrent play of a plurality of games of chances on a single display screen.

Cannon does not describe “the expected value of a first sub-game as derived from the displayed partial outcome of the first sub-game is used to select the displayed fewer than full set of images of the remaining sub-games in the initial display,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claims 1, and 11 – 14 are allowable in view of Williams and Cannon for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 15, 35, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Cannon and U.S. Pub. No 2003/0054877 (“Baerlocher”).

Claims 35 and 50 have been cancelled.

The rejections of claims 35 and 50 are thus deemed moot.

Claim 15 depends from amended claim 1, and is therefore allowable in view of Williams and Cannon.

Baerlocher fails to cure the deficiencies of Williams and Cannon.

Rather, Baerlocher merely discloses partially revealing a first award on display device of a gaming apparatus.

Baerlocher does not describe “the expected value of a first sub-game as derived from the displayed partial outcome of the first sub-game is used to select the displayed fewer than full set of images of the remaining sub-games in the initial display,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claims 1 and 15 are allowable in view of Williams, Cannon and Baerlocher for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 51 – 64 have been added.

Independent claim 51 is directed to “[a] method of playing a wagering game on a gaming machine.” The method includes, among other things, “displaying on said display a partial outcome of said game through fewer than a full set of images of each of said sub-games, and wherein an expected value of one sub-game as derived from said one of said sub-games is used to select said fewer than a full set of images of said remaining sub-games.”

Support for amended claim 51 can be found in the Specification.

For example, paragraph [0008] provides an exemplary definition of an “expected value.”

For example, paragraphs [0078] to [0082] provide an exemplary explanation of how an expected value of one of the sub-games is used to determine images of the rest of the sub-games to be displayed.

As described above, Williams neither anticipates nor meets, among other things, “displaying on said display a partial outcome of said game through fewer than a full set of images of each of said sub-games, and wherein an expected value of one sub-game as derived from said one of said sub-games is used to select said fewer than a full set of images of said remaining sub-games,” as recited in claim 51.

Similarly, Williams, Cannon, and Baerlocher, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest as discussed above, among other things, “displaying on said display a partial outcome of said game through fewer than a full set of images of each of said sub-games, and wherein an expected value of one sub-game as derived from said one of said sub-games is used to select said fewer than a full set of images of said remaining sub-games,” as recited in claim 51.

As such, claim 51 is allowable in view of Williams, Cannon, and Baerlocher.

Claims 52 – 64 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 51.

No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 15, and 51 – 64 are allowable. In the event that the Examiner believes a telephone interview with the undersigned Applicants' Representative would be helpful in advancing prosecution of this patent application, the undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 30, 2009

/Larry M. Jarvis/
Larry M. Jarvis
Reg. No. 27,341

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison Street
34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Fax (312) 775-8100